

On derived categories of differential complexes

LUISA FIOROT

RÉSUMÉ. Cet article est consacré à la comparaison entre différentes catégories localisées de complexes différentiels. Nous prouvons que le foncteur canonique de la catégorie des complexes différentiels d'ordre un (définie par Herrera et Lieberman) à valeurs dans la catégorie des complexes différentiels (d'ordre arbitraire, définie par M. Saito), localisées par rapport à une bonne notion de quasi-isomorphismes, est une équivalence de catégories. En suite nous prouvons un résultat analogue pour une version filtrée des catégories précédentes (définies respectivement par Du Bois et M. Saito), localisées par les quasi-isomorphismes gradués. Cet résultat répond à une question posée par M. Saito.

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to the comparison of different localized categories of differential complexes. The first result is that the canonical functor from the category of complexes of differential operators of order one (defined by Herrera and Lieberman) to the category of differential complexes (of any order, defined by M. Saito), both localized with respect to a suitable notion of quasi-isomorphism, is an equivalence of categories. Then we prove a similar result for a filtered version of the previous categories (defined respectively by Du Bois and M. Saito), localized with respect to graded-quasi-isomorphisms, thus answering a question posed by M. Saito.

Introduction.

The category of differential complexes appears naturally as a “good” category for the role of image of the classical De Rham functor. We are interested in finding a purely algebraic definition for the image category of the De Rham functor for differential modules which will permit us to develop the formalism of the six Grothendieck operations.

Such a category was first introduced by Herrera-Lieberman in their article in *Inventiones Math.* of 1971. In that paper they proposed the study of a category $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ of complexes of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules with differential operators of order one (where X is a smooth algebraic or analytic variety over a field K of characteristic zero). They also interpreted $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ as a category of graded modules over a suitable graded ring $\mathcal{C}_X^\bullet$ containing $\Omega_X^\bullet$ as a sub-ring. Using this interpretation they defined the functors $- \otimes_{\Omega^\bullet} -$, $\mathcal{H}om_{\Omega^\bullet}(-, -)$, f^* and f_* . Then they defined hyperext functors using suitable injective resolutions and proved a duality theorem in the proper smooth case.

They did not propose in that paper to localize $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with respect to a multiplicative system as is done in the study of derived categories, although they did introduce a notion of homotopy.

The difficulty in the localization procedure was first pointed out by P. Berthelot in his book of 1974 [B], where he showed that objects of $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ which are quasi-isomorphic as complexes of abelian sheaves, may lead to non isomorphic hyperext functors. On the other hand, we are forced to localize $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$, if we wish to obtain a triangulated category where a De Rham functor DR , with source some derived category of $\mathcal{D}_X$ -Modules, can assume its values. By Berthelot's remark we know that the multiplicative system of abelian quasi-isomorphisms is not a good choice.

Different localizations were proposed by Philippe Du Bois who, in [DB.1], introduced filtrations and so obtained the category $DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$, and by Morihiko

2000 AMS classification 14F30. Partially supported by PGR "CPDG021784" (University of Padova).

Saito who, in [S.1] and [S.2], defined a new category of complexes $C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with differential operators (of any order) which he localized with respect to $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ -quasi-isomorphism (obtaining $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$) or with respect to filtered quasi-isomorphism (obtaining $DF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$).

Saito's category $C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ seems to be the best choice because it is equivalent to the category $D(\mathcal{O}_X)$ via the functors $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X$ and $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$. The problem is that in Saito's category an explicit formalism of Grothendieck operations is only partially realized; in fact, for example, there is no f^* functor or internal tensor product. From the Herrera-Lieberman point of view, considering the category $D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ obtained by localizing $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with respect to $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ -quasi-isomorphism, we obtain a category wherein the De Rham functor takes its image and where the Grothendieck operations are easier and more complete than those in Saito's category $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$.

This work is devoted to the comparisons between the categories of differential complexes $D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ and $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. In the first section we recall some general definitions we need in this paper and the notation we will use. Then in Section 2 we develop a general result about morphisms to a total complex in a general category of complexes. In Section 3 we compare Saito category $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with $D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. In fact we prove that the canonical functor between the localized categories $i_{HL,S} : D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is an equivalence of categories. In the last section we extend this comparison result to the filtered case proving that the filtered Du Bois category $DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ and Saito's $DF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ are equivalent, thus answering a question posed by Saito in [S.1, 2.2.11].

I would like to thank Prof. Francesco Baldassarri for having introduced me to this matter. It is a pleasure to thank Maurizio Cailotto and Morihiko Saito for the improvements and suggestions they gave me in the redaction of this work.

1. Notation and definitions.

Let X be a smooth separated scheme of finite type over a field K of characteristic zero, or a smooth analytic variety.

1.1. Definition. Herrera-Liebermann differential complexes.

As in [HL, §2] or [B, II.5], the category $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is defined as the category of complexes of differential operators of order at most one, that is:

- i) the objects of $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ are complexes whose terms are $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules and whose differentials are differential operators of order less than or equal to one;
- ii) morphisms between such complexes are morphisms of complexes which are $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear maps.

We denote by $C_1^b(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ the full subcategory of $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ whose objects are bounded complexes.

1.2. Proposition. *The category $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is equivalent to the category of graded left $\mathcal{C}_X^\bullet$ -Modules where $\mathcal{C}_X^\bullet \cong \Omega_X^{\bullet-1}D \oplus \Omega_X^\bullet$ is the “mapping cylinder” of the identity map of $\Omega_X^\bullet$. It is a graded $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Algebra, whose product is defined using the wedge product of $\Omega_X^\bullet$ and $D^2 = 0$, while the structure of complex is defined by $D\alpha = (d\alpha_1 + (-1)^i\alpha_2)D + d\alpha_2$ if $\alpha = \alpha_1D + \alpha_2$ with $\alpha_1 \in \Omega_X^{i-1}$ and $\alpha_2 \in \Omega_X^i$. Therefore, the category $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ has enough injectives [HL, §2].*

1.3. Definition. A homotopy between two morphisms in $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is a homotopy in the sense of the category of complexes of abelian sheaves, except that the homotopy operator (of degree -1) is taken to be $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear (see [HL, §2]).

1.4. Definition. Let $\mathcal{D}_X$ be the sheaf of differential operators on X (see [Bo] for the definition) and $p : \mathcal{D}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ the map evaluating a differential operator in 1. In [S.2] Saito defines a differential operator $d : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, between two $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, as a morphism which can be factorized (in a unique way) as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{G} \\ & \searrow \bar{d} & \uparrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{G}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} p \\ & & \mathcal{G} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \end{array}$$

where $\bar{d}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear map and $\mathcal{G} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X$ is an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Module for the right multiplication of $\mathcal{D}_X$.

We note that the morphism $\bar{d}$ induces by extension of scalars a morphism of $\mathcal{D}_X$ -Modules $\bar{d}' : \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X$.

We use the notation $M(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ for the additive category whose objects are $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules and morphisms are differential operators between them.

1.5. Definition. Saito differential complexes.

In [S.2] Saito defines the equivalence of categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} : M(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) & \longrightarrow & M_i(\mathcal{D}_X)^r \\ \mathcal{F} & \longmapsto & \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \\ d & \longmapsto & \bar{d}' \end{array}$$

where $M_i(\mathcal{D}_X)^r$ is the full subcategory of right $\mathcal{D}_X$ -Modules whose objects are induced modules (i.e. they are of the form $\mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X$ for an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Module $\mathcal{F}$).

Let $C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ be the category of complexes in $M(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. Then the $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ functor extends to a functor $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} : C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \rightarrow C(\mathcal{D}_X)^r$.

1.6. Remark. In Definition 1.1 we have introduced the Herrera-Lieberman category $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. The main difference between $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ and $C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is that Herrera-Liebermann allow only differential operators of order one and morphisms between complexes are $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear, while Saito considers complexes with arbitrary differential operators and morphisms between complexes given by differential operators. We observe that the map $p : \mathcal{D}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ is a differential operator but it is not of finite order.

There is a natural functor $\lambda_1 : C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \rightarrow C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ which sends objects of the first category into themselves regarded as objects of $C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. This functor is not faithful.

1.7. Definition. We define $D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ to be the category obtained localizing the category $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ of Herrera and Lieberman with respect to the multiplicative system of morphisms

$$S_{1, \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}} := \{f \in C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \mid \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} \circ i_{HL, S}(f) \text{ is a quasi-isomorphism in } D(\mathcal{D}_X)^r\}$$

called the system of $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ -quasi-isomorphisms. We refer to this category as the Herrera-Lieberman localized category.

1.8. Definition. We define the category $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ by localizing the category $C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with respect to the multiplicative system

$$S_{\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X}^{-1} := \{f \in C(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \mid \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}(f) \text{ is a quasi-isomorphism in } D(\mathcal{D}_X)^r\}.$$

1.9. Remark. The natural functor λ_1 respects $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ -quasi-isomorphisms so it defines a functor (which we again denote by λ_1)

$$\lambda_1 : D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X).$$

It seems to be not straightforward to prove that this functor is fully faithful.

We recall that Saito proved in [S.2] that the usual De Rham functor (for right $\mathcal{D}_X$ -Modules)

$$\text{DR}_X := - \otimes_{\mathcal{D}_X}^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{O}_X : D^b(\mathcal{D}_X)^r \longrightarrow D^b(K_X)$$

factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D^b(\mathcal{D}_X)^r & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X} & D^b(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \\ & \searrow \text{DR}_X & \downarrow \\ & & D^b(K_X) \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrow is the functor obtained by forgetting all structure of an object in $D^b(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ but that of K_X -Module; and $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X$ is the functor

$$(1.9.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X : D^b(\mathcal{D}_X)^r & \longrightarrow & D^b(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \\ \mathcal{M}^\bullet & \longmapsto & \mathcal{M}^\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X}^\bullet \Theta_X^\bullet. \end{array}$$

($\Theta_X^i = \wedge^{-i} \Theta_X$) which could be extended to unbounded complexes.

For $\mathcal{M}^\bullet \in D^b(\mathcal{D}_X)^r$ we have the following three descriptions of $\text{DR}_X(\mathcal{M}^\bullet)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DR}_X(\mathcal{M}^\bullet) &= \mathcal{M}^\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{D}_X}^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{O}_X \\ &= \mathcal{M}^\bullet \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X}^\bullet \Theta_X^\bullet \\ &= \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}_X}(\omega_X, \mathcal{M}^\bullet)[n] \end{aligned}$$

in $D^b(K_X)$ where $n = \dim X$.

We observe that the functor $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X$, extended to unbounded complexes, also factors through $D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$, so we obtain the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D(\mathcal{D}_X)^r & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X}} & D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \\ & \searrow \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X & \downarrow \lambda_1 \\ & & D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X). \end{array}$$

The composition $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X} \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ defines a functor $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. In the sequel, we will prove that λ_1 and $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X} \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ are quasi-inverses of each other and so define an equivalence of categories.

1.10. Theorem. (Saito[S.2]) *The functors $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X$ and $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ are equivalences between the categories $D(\mathcal{D}_X)^r$ and $D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$.*

2. Morphisms between a complex and a total complex.

2.1 Notation. In this section, we consider an additive category $\mathcal{A}$, the category of complexes and the category of naïf bounded bicomplexes on it (naïf means that the differentials commute, and bounded means that in any anti-diagonal only a finite number of terms are not isomorphic to zero). We want to describe the morphisms of complexes between a complex and the total complex associated to a bicomplex.

2.2. Lemma. Let $I^{\bullet,\bullet}$ be a bicomplex with commuting differentials d'_I and d''_I . We define the bicomplex $\tilde{I}^{\bullet,\bullet}$ in the following way: for any p and q let $\tilde{I}^{p,q} = I^{p,q}$, $d'^{p,q}_I = (-1)^q d'^{p,q}_I$ and $d''^{p,q}_I = (-1)^p d''^{p,q}_I$. Then:

- (i) the functor $\sim$ sending $I^{\bullet,\bullet}$ to $\tilde{I}^{\bullet,\bullet}$ is an automorphism of the category of bicomplexes, and $\tilde{\tilde{I}} = I$ for any bicomplex I .
- (ii) the canonical map $\sigma_I^{\bullet,\bullet} : I^{\bullet,\bullet} \longrightarrow \tilde{I}^{\bullet,\bullet}$ defined by $\sigma_I^{p,q} = (-1)^{pq} \text{id}_{I^{p,q}}$ is an isomorphism of bicomplexes and defines an isomorphism of functors $\sigma : \text{id} \rightarrow \sim$.

2.3. Corollary. Let $A^\bullet$, resp; $B^{\bullet,\bullet}$, be a complex resp. a bicomplex in $\mathcal{A}$. Then we have a commutative diagram of canonical isomorphisms of bicomplexes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{\bullet,q}) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{B^\bullet}^{s,q}} & \text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q}) \\ \sigma_{\text{Hom}}^{s,q} \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{Hom}}^{s,q} \\ \widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, B^{\bullet,q}) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\sigma}_{B^\bullet}^{s,q}} & \widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q}) \end{array}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, B^{\bullet,q})_{s,q} = (\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{\bullet,q})_{s,q})^\sim$$

and

$$\widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q})_{s,q} = \left(\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q})_{s,q} \right)^\sim,$$

the horizontal morphisms are

$$\sigma_{A^\bullet} = \text{Hom}^\bullet(\text{id}_{A^\bullet}, \sigma_B) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{B^\bullet} = \widetilde{\text{Hom}}^\bullet(\text{id}_{A^\bullet}, \sigma_B),$$

and the vertical ones are

$$\sigma_{\text{Hom}}^{s,q} = \sigma_{\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{\bullet,q})} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{\text{Hom}}^{s,q} = \sigma_{\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q})}.$$

Proof. This is a consequence of the previous lemma. $\square$

2.4. Proposition. Using the previous notation, let $B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet$ indicate the total complex associated to $B^{\bullet,\bullet}$. Then the complex $\text{Hom}^\bullet(A^\bullet, B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet)$ is canonically identified with:

- (1) the total complex of $(\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet}))_{s,p}$:

$$\text{Hom}^\bullet(A^\bullet, B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet) \cong \left((\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet}))_{s,p} \right)_{\text{tot}};$$

- (1') the total complex of $\left(\widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q}) \right)_{s,q}$:

$$\text{Hom}^\bullet(A^\bullet, B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet) \cong \left(\left(\widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q}) \right)_{s,q} \right)_{\text{tot}}.$$

Proof. The corresponding terms being clearly isomorphic, we only have to prove that the differentials in the two complexes coincide.

- (1) Consider the family $\Phi = \{\varphi_r^{a,p} : A^a \rightarrow B^{p,a+r-p}\}_{a,p}$ which describes an element of $\text{Hom}^r(A^\bullet, B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet)$ as well as of $\bigoplus_{s+p=r} \text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet})$. Its image using the differential of the first complex is

$$\begin{aligned} D(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,p} &= (d_{B_{\text{tot}}} \Phi)_{r+1}^{a,p} + (-1)^{r+1} (\Phi d_A)_{r+1}^{a,p} \\ &= d_B'^{p-1,a+r-p+1} \varphi_r^{a,p-1} + (-1)^p d_B''^{p,a+r-p} \varphi_r^{a,p} + (-1)^{r+1} \varphi_r^{a+1,p} d_A^a. \end{aligned}$$

Using the second complex and the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet}) & \xrightarrow{D''^{s,p}} & \text{Hom}^{s+1}(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet}) \\ & & \uparrow D'^{s+1,p-1} \\ & & \text{Hom}^{s+1}(A^\bullet, B^{p-1,\bullet}), \end{array}$$

one sees that for $s = r - p$ the image is

$$\begin{aligned} D(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,p} &= D'(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,p} + (-1)^p D''(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,p} \\ &= d_B'^{p-1,a+r-p+1} \varphi_r^{a,p-1} + (-1)^p d_B''^{p,a+r-p} \varphi_r^{a,p} + (-1)^{r+1} \varphi_r^{a+1,p} d_A^a. \end{aligned}$$

So the two differentials coincide.

- (1') In this case the differential of the first complex is

$$\begin{aligned} D(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,q} &= (d_{B_{\text{tot}}} \Phi)_{r+1}^{a,q} + (-1)^{r+1} (\Phi d_A)_{r+1}^{a,q} \\ &= d_B'^{a+r-q,q} \varphi_r^{a,q} + (-1)^{a+r-q+1} d_B''^{a+r-q+1,q-1} \varphi_r^{a,q-1} + (-1)^{r+1} \varphi_r^{a+1,q} d_A^a. \end{aligned}$$

Using the second complex the image is

$$\begin{aligned} D(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,q} &= \tilde{D}'(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,q} + (-1)^{r-q+1} \tilde{D}''(\Phi)_{r+1}^{a,q} \\ &= d_B'^{a+r-q,q} \varphi_r^{a,q} + (-1)^{a+r-q+1} d_B''^{a+r-q+1,q-1} \varphi_r^{a,q-1} + (-1)^{r+1} \varphi_r^{a+1,q} d_A^a. \end{aligned}$$

So the two differentials so indeed coincide. $\square$

2.5. Theorem. *The following sets are canonically isomorphic:*

- (1) the set $\text{Hom}(A^\bullet, B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet)$ of morphisms of complexes between a complex and the total complex of a bicomplex;
- (2) the set of cycles $Z^0(\text{Hom}^\bullet(A^\bullet, B_{\text{tot}}^\bullet))$;
- (3) the set of cycles $Z^0\left(\left(\text{Hom}^s(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet})\right)_{s,p}\right)_{\text{tot}}$;
- (3') the set of cycles $Z^0\left(\left(\widetilde{\text{Hom}}^s(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q})\right)_{s,q}\right)_{\text{tot}}$;
- (4) the set of families of maps $\{\varphi^{\bullet,p} \in \text{Hom}^{-p}(A^\bullet, B^{p,\bullet})\}_p$ such that

$$(-1)^p d_{\text{Hom}}^{-p}(\varphi^{\bullet,p}) + d_B'^{p-1,\bullet-p+1} \varphi^{\bullet,p-1} = 0$$

for any p ;

- (4') the set of families of maps $\{\varphi^{\bullet,q} \in \widetilde{\text{Hom}}^{-q}(A^\bullet, \tilde{B}^{\bullet,q})\}_q$ such that

$$\widetilde{d_{\text{Hom}}^{-q}}(\varphi^{\bullet,q}) + (-1)^{q-1} d_B''^{\bullet-q+1,q-1} \varphi^{\bullet,q-1} = 0$$

for any q ;

- (5) the set of families of maps (not maps of complexes in general) $\{\varphi^{\bullet,p} : A^\bullet \rightarrow B^{p,\bullet}[-p]\}_p$ such that the “defect of commutativity” with differentials of one map is “corrected” by the previous map:

$$\varphi^{\bullet+1,p} d_A^\bullet - d_{B^{p,\bullet}[-p]}^\bullet \varphi^{\bullet,p} = d_B'^{p-1,\bullet-p+1} \varphi^{\bullet,p-1}$$

for any p ;

- (5') the set of families of maps (not maps of complexes in general) $\{\varphi^{\bullet,q} : A^\bullet \rightarrow B^{\bullet,q}[-q]\}_q$ such that the “defect of commutativity” with differentials of one map is “corrected” by the previous map:

$$\varphi^{\bullet+1,q} d_A^\bullet - d_{\tilde{B}^{\bullet,q}[-q]}^\bullet \varphi^{\bullet,q} = d_{\tilde{B}}^{\bullet-q+1,q-1} \varphi^{\bullet,q-1}$$

for any q ;

- (6) the set of families of maps $\{\varphi^{a,p} : A^a \rightarrow B^{p,a-p}\}_{a,p}$ satisfying the following conditions

$$(2.5.1) \quad \varphi^{a+1,p} d_A^a - (-1)^p d_B^{\prime p,a-p} \varphi^{a,p} = d_B^{\prime p-1,a-p+1} \varphi^{a,p-1}$$

for any a, p ;

- (6') the set of families of maps $\{\varphi^{a,q} : A^a \rightarrow B^{a-q,q}\}_{a,q}$ satisfying the following conditions

$$\varphi^{a+1,q} d_A^a - d_B^{\prime a-q,q} \varphi^{a,q} = (-1)^{a-q+1} d_B^{\prime a-q+1,q-1} \varphi^{a,q-1}$$

for any a, q ;

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) are well known, and the equivalence with (3) and (3') follows from (1) and (1'), respectively, of the Proposition 2.4.

The descriptions (6) and (6') follow directly from (1) by making the commutativity condition for the morphism with the differentials explicit.

The descriptions (4) and (4') follow directly from (3) and (3'), respectively.

The descriptions (5) and (5') are reformulations of (4) and (4'), respectively, as well as of (6) and (6'), respectively. $\square$

2.6. Remark. The descriptions (6) and (6') are useful for applications, while (4) and (4') give the most intuitive construction of the morphisms from a complex to the total complex associated to a bicomplex: we have to define for any i a map of graded objects from the complex to the i -th row (resp. column) shifted by $-i$, in such a way that each map is the defect of commutativity for the differentials of the next map.

3. Comparison between Saito and HL-localizations.

3.1. Remark. Let $\mathcal{F}^\bullet$ be an object in $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. By definition the differential $d_{\mathcal{F}}^i : \mathcal{F}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+1}$ is a differential operator of order one. So it defines in a unique way a morphism $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{F}}^i : \mathcal{F}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_{X,1}$. Locally for each section s of $\mathcal{F}^i$, $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{F}}^i(s)$ is a section of $\mathcal{F}^{i+1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_{X,1}$ so it may be locally written in a unique way as

$$(3.1.1) \quad \bar{d}_{\mathcal{F}}^i(s) = d_{\mathcal{F}}^i(s) \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n d_{x_j}^i(s) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$$

using the $\mathcal{O}_X$ -base of $\mathcal{D}_{X,1}$ given in local coordinates by $1, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$. The maps $d_{\mathcal{F}}^i : \mathcal{F}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+1}$ are the differentials of the complex $\mathcal{F}^\bullet$; while $d_{x_j}^i : \mathcal{F}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+1}$ are maps of abelian sheaves.

3.2. Definition. Let by definition $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j} : \mathcal{F}^i \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j}$ be the maps defined as follow:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}^i & \xrightarrow{\bar{d}} \mathcal{F}^{i+1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_{X,1} & \xrightarrow{\bar{d} \otimes id} \dots \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_{X,1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \dots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_{X,1} \\ & \searrow \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j} & \downarrow \\ & & \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j}. \end{array}$$

The vertical map is the identity on $\mathcal{F}^{i+1}$ tensor the map obtained by the composition of the projections $\mathcal{D}_{X,1} \longrightarrow \Theta_X^1$ and $\Theta_X^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \dots \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^1 \longrightarrow \Theta_X^{-j}$. We observe that these maps $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j}$ are related to the structural morphisms of the $\Omega_X^\bullet$ -module

$$\mathcal{F}^i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_X^j \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+j};$$

in fact they are adjoints because $\Theta_X^{-j} := \wedge^j \Theta_X \cong \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Omega_X^j, \mathcal{O}_X)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}^i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Omega_X^j, \mathcal{F}^{i+j}) &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}^i, \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Omega_X^j, \mathcal{F}^{i+j})) \\ &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}^i, \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j}). \end{aligned}$$

3.3. Definition. Let $\mathcal{F}^\bullet \in C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathrm{Diff}_X)$. We define for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ ($n = \dim X$) the maps

$$(3.3.1) \quad \eta_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,0} = id_{\mathcal{F}^i} : \mathcal{F}^i \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^i$$

and

$$(3.3.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \eta_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j} : \mathcal{F}^i & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j} \\ s & \longmapsto & \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_j} d_{x_{i_j}}^{i+j-1} \circ \dots \circ d_{x_{i_1}}^i(s) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_j}} \end{array}$$

for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then (up to a sign $(-1)^{\binom{j}{2}}$) we have that $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j} = j! \eta_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j}$, so these maps $\eta_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j}$ do not depend on local coordinates.

3.4. Lemma. Given $\mathcal{F}^\bullet \in C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathrm{Diff}_X)$; the morphisms $d_{\mathcal{F}}^i, d_{x_j}^i$ of (3.1.1) for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ satisfy the following conditions:

- i) $d_{\mathcal{F}}^{i+1} \circ d_{\mathcal{F}}^i = 0$
- ii) $d_{x_j}^{i+1} \circ d_{\mathcal{F}}^i + d_{\mathcal{F}}^{i+1} \circ d_{x_j}^i = 0$
- iii) $d_{x_j}^{i+1} \circ d_{x_k}^i + d_{x_k}^{i+1} \circ d_{x_j}^i = 0$
- iv) $d_{x_j}^{i+1} \circ d_{x_j}^i = 0$.

Proof. The first condition is given by the hypothesis $\mathcal{F}^\bullet \in C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathrm{Diff}_X)$. The conditions ii) to iv) follow from the condition that the composition

$$\overline{d_{\mathcal{F}}^{i+1} \circ d_{\mathcal{F}}^i} : \mathcal{F}^i \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{i+2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_{X,2}$$

is zero because it corresponds to $d_{\mathcal{F}}^{i+1} \circ d_{\mathcal{F}}^i = 0$. $\square$

3.5. Definition. Let $i : \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_X$ be the usual inclusion which is linear for both the $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Module structures of $\mathcal{D}_X$. Given $\mathcal{F}^\bullet \in C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathrm{Diff}_X)$ we define the morphisms

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^i : \mathcal{F}^i \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j}$$

for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ in the following way: we consider the composition

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}^i & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j}} & \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j} \\ & \searrow \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j} & \downarrow id_{\mathcal{F}^{i+j}} \otimes id_{\Theta_X^{-j}} \\ & & \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j} \end{array}$$

and by definition $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^i := \sum_{j=0}^n \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{i,j}$.

We want to prove that the morphisms $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^i : \mathcal{F}^i \longrightarrow (\widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X \widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X^{-1}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet))^i$ define a morphism of complexes.

3.6. Theorem. *The maps $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^i$ of 3.5 define*

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{F}^\bullet \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X \widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X^{-1}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet)$$

which is a morphism of complexes in $C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathrm{Diff}_X)$.

Proof. We have to prove that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}^i & \xrightarrow{d_{\mathcal{F}}^i} & \mathcal{F}^{i+1} \\ \downarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^i & & \downarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{i+1} \\ \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j} & \xrightarrow[\widetilde{\mathrm{DR}} \widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}^{-1}]{d_{\mathcal{F}}^{i+1}} & \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \mathcal{F}^{i+1+j} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

We recall that $\widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X \widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X^{-1}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet) = (\mathcal{G}^\bullet)_{\mathrm{tot}}$ where

$$\mathcal{G}^{p,q} = \mathcal{F}^q \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^p$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{G}}^{p,q} : \mathcal{F}^q \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^p \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^q \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{p+1}$$

is

$$(3.6.1) \quad d_{\mathcal{G}}^{p,q} = id_{\mathcal{F}^q} \otimes d_{\mathcal{D}_X}^p;$$

while

$$d_{\mathcal{G}}^{\prime p,q} : \mathcal{F}^q \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^p \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{q+1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{D}_X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^p$$

is

$$(3.6.2) \quad d_{\mathcal{G}}^{\prime p,q} = \widetilde{\mathrm{DR}}_X^{-1}(d_{\mathcal{F}}^q) \otimes id_{\Theta_X^p}.$$

Now by Lemma 2.5, we have only to prove that (2.5.1)

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{a+1,p} \circ d_{\mathcal{F}}^a - (-1)^p d_{\mathcal{G}}^{\prime -p,a+p} \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{a,p} = d_{\mathcal{G}}^{\prime -p-1,a+p+1} \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{a,p+1}$$

is true.

Let s be a section of $\mathcal{F}^a$, then

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{a+1,p} \circ d_{\mathcal{F}}^a(s) = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} d_{x_{i_p}}^{a+p} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^{a+1} d_{\mathcal{F}}^a(s) \otimes 1 \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_p}};$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\mathcal{G}}''^{-p, a+p} \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{a, p}(s) = \\
& = d_{\mathcal{G}}''^{-p, a+p} \left(\sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} d_{x_{i_p}}^{a+p-1} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^a(s) \otimes 1 \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_p}} \right) = \\
& = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} d_{\mathcal{F}}^{a+p} (d_{x_{i_p}}^{a+p-1} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^a(s)) \otimes 1 \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_p}} + \\
& + \sum_k \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} d_{x_k}^{a+p} (d_{x_{i_p}}^{a+p-1} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^a(s)) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \otimes \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_p}} \right) = \\
& = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} (-1)^p d_{x_{i_p}}^{a+p} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^{a+1} d_{\mathcal{F}}^a(s) \otimes 1 \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_p}} + \\
& + \sum_k \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_{p+1}} (-1)^{p+k} d_{x_{i_{p+1}}}^{a+p} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^a(s) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \otimes \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_k}}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_{p+1}}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the right hand side of (2.5.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\mathcal{G}}'^{-p-1, a+p+1} \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{a, p+1}(s) = \\
& = d_{\mathcal{G}}'^{-p-1, a+p+1} \left(\sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_{p+1}} d_{x_{i_{p+1}}}^{a+p} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^a(s) \otimes 1 \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_{p+1}}} \right) = \\
& = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_{p+1}} \sum_k (-1)^{k+1} d_{x_{i_{p+1}}}^{a+p} \dots d_{x_{i_1}}^a(s) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \otimes \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_k}}} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_{p+1}}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have established our assertion. $\square$

3.7. Theorem. *The functor*

$$\lambda_1 : D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$$

is an equivalence of categories with quasi-inverse the functor

$$\widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1, X} \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} : D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X).$$

Proof. Let $G := \widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1, X} \circ \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$.

By Saito's results we obtain $\lambda_1 \circ G = \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X \circ \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} \xrightarrow{\cong} id_{D(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)}$. We want to prove that there exists an isomorphism of functors $id_{D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)} \longrightarrow G \circ \lambda_1$.

In 3.5 we defined a functorial morphism $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{\bullet} : \mathcal{F}^{\bullet} \longrightarrow G \circ \lambda_1(\mathcal{F}^{\bullet})$ (for each $\mathcal{F}^{\bullet} \in D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$) which is a $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ -quasi-isomorphism because the triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{F}^{\bullet} & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}^{\bullet}} & G \circ \lambda_1(\mathcal{F}^{\bullet}) \\
& \searrow id_{\mathcal{F}^{\bullet}} & \downarrow \\
& & \mathcal{F}^{\bullet}
\end{array}$$

commutes (where the vertical map is that induced by the projection $\mathcal{D}_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ and it is a $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}$ -quasi-isomorphism by Saito's result). So the morphism defined by the functor $\Phi : id_{D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)} \longrightarrow G \circ \lambda_1$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

4. Comparison between Saito and Du Bois categories.

4.1. Definition. By definition the category $CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is the category whose objects are filtered complexes $(K^\bullet, d, F)$ such that:

- i) $K^\bullet$ is a complex of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules;
- ii) F is a decreasing filtration on $K^\bullet$ given by sub- $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules and F is biregular (that is on every component K^i of $K^\bullet$, F induces a finite filtration; so there exist integers p and q such that $F^p K^i = K^i$ and $F^q K^i = 0$);
- iii) d is a relative differential operator of order at most 1 which respects the filtrations;
- iv) $\text{gr}_F(d)$ is $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear.

Morphisms in $CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ are $f^\bullet : \mathcal{F}^\bullet \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bullet$ $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear maps commuting with differentials and compatible with filtrations [DB.1, 1].

4.2. Remark. The complex $\Omega_X^\bullet$ is filtered by truncation so $\text{Gr}_F^p(\Omega_X^\bullet) = \Omega_X^p$.

4.3. Definition. A filtered homotopy between $u, v : \mathcal{F}^\bullet \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bullet$ is a homotopy h such that $h^i(F^p \mathcal{F}^i) \subseteq F^p \mathcal{G}^{i-1}$ and h^i is $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear.

Let $KF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ be the category whose objects are those of $CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ and whose morphisms are the classes of morphisms in $CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ up to homotopy.

4.4. Definition. A morphism $f^\bullet : \mathcal{F}^\bullet \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bullet$ is said a filtered quasi-isomorphism if $\text{gr} f$ is a quasi-isomorphism where gr is the functor

$$\text{gr} : CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow CG(X)$$

sending a filtered complex $(\mathcal{F}^\bullet, F)$ to its graded complex. (Here $CG(X)$ is the category of complexes of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules with a finite graduation in each degree.)

Let $DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ be the category obtained by localizing $KF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with respect to filtered quasi-isomorphisms.

4.5. Remark. The categories $KF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ and $DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ are triangulated categories where

- i) the shift functor is the usual one: $T(K)^i = K^{i+1}$, $d_{T(K)} = -d_K$ and $F_{T(K)} = F_K$;
- ii) if $f^\bullet : \mathcal{F}^\bullet \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bullet$ is a morphism in $CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ its mapping cone is $\mathcal{M}^\bullet := T(\mathcal{F}^\bullet) \oplus \mathcal{G}^\bullet \in C_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with filtration defined by $F^p(\mathcal{M}^\bullet) = F^p T(\mathcal{F}^\bullet) \oplus F^p \mathcal{G}^\bullet$ and differential $d_{\mathcal{M}}$ defined by the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} d_{T(\mathcal{F})} & 0 \\ T(f) & d_{\mathcal{G}} \end{bmatrix}$.

4.6. Definition. Let $(\mathcal{L}_j, F)$ with $j \in \{1, 2\}$ be two filtered $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules with increasing filtration such that $F_p \mathcal{L}_j = 0$ for $p \ll 0$. By definition

$$\mathcal{H}om_{\text{Diff}_{X/S}}((\mathcal{L}_1, F), (\mathcal{L}_2, F))$$

is the sheaf of filtered differential operators, that is $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}om_{\text{Diff}_{X/S}}((\mathcal{L}_1, F), (\mathcal{L}_2, F))$ if and only if the composition

$$(4.6.1) \quad F_{-p} \mathcal{L}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_1 \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathcal{L}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_2 / F_{p-q-1} \mathcal{L}_2$$

has order at most q for each p, q .

This condition implies that $\Phi(F_p \mathcal{L}_1) \subset F_p \mathcal{L}_2$ and that the map between the graded objects $\text{Gr}_p^F(\mathcal{L}_1) \longrightarrow \text{Gr}_p^F(\mathcal{L}_2)$ is $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear.

4.7. Remark. We observe that if $(\mathcal{L}_1, F) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{L}_2, F)$ is a filtered differential operator of order one then the condition (4.6.1) is equivalent to the condition given by

Du Bois of having graded $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear for the objects $(\mathcal{L}_j, F')$ where $F'^p \mathcal{L}_j = F_{-p} \mathcal{L}_j$ is the opposite filtration.

4.8. Definition. We denote by $CF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ the category of complexes of (increasing) filtered $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Modules and filtered differential operators.

The functor λ_1 induces a functor which we denote by

$$\lambda_1 F : CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow CF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X).$$

It sends objects of $CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ into themselves with the opposite filtration (which becomes increasing). We denote by $DF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ the category obtained localizing $CF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ with respect to filtered quasi-isomorphisms.

4.9. Theorem. The functor

$$\lambda_1 F : DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X) \longrightarrow DF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$$

is an equivalence of categories; so also is the functor

$$\widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X} F : DF(\mathcal{D}_X)^r \longrightarrow DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X).$$

Proof. Saito proved that the functor $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X F : DF(\mathcal{D}_X)^r \longrightarrow DF(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ is an equivalence of categories with quasi-inverse the functor $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} F$. We want to extend the result of the previous section to the filtered context. As for the non filtered case, let $GF = \widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X} F \circ \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} F$ we have only to prove that there is an isomorphism of functors $id_{DF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)} \longrightarrow GF \circ \lambda_1 F$.

In the previous section we defined an isomorphism of functors

$$\Phi : id_{D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X} \circ \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1} \circ \lambda_1 F$$

into $D_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$. Now given $(\mathcal{F}^\bullet, F) \in CF_1(\mathcal{O}_X, \text{Diff}_X)$ we want to prove that the morphism $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}^\bullet}$ respects the filtrations, so it induces an isomorphism of functors also in the filtered case. We observe that the map $\eta_{\mathcal{F}^\bullet}^{i,j}$ satisfies:

$$(4.9.1) \quad \eta_{\mathcal{F}^\bullet}^{i,j} : F_p(\mathcal{F}^i) \longrightarrow F_p(\mathcal{F}^{i+j}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \Theta_X^{-j}$$

because the differentials of the complex respect the filtrations.

We recall that the filtration on the complex $\widetilde{\text{DR}}_{1,X} \widetilde{\text{DR}}_X^{-1}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet)$ is built as explained in [S.1; 2.1.3, 2.1.5] for a single $\mathcal{O}_X$ -Module $\mathcal{F}$. Generalizing this construction to complexes we have that

$$F_p\left(\bigoplus_{j=0}^n \mathcal{F}^{i+j} \otimes \mathcal{D}_X \otimes \Theta_X^j\right) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \sum_{l \geq 0} F_{p-l}(\mathcal{F}^{i+j}) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{X,l} \otimes \Theta_X^{-j}.$$

This implies that also $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}^\bullet}^{i,j}$ respects the filtrations because $F_p(\mathcal{F}^i)$ takes image into $F_p(\mathcal{F}^{i+j}) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{X,0} \otimes \Theta_X^{-j}$; so we have established our thesis. $\square$

References.

- [B] Berthelot P. Cohomologie cristalline des schémas de caractéristique $p > 0$. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 407. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1974.
- [Bo] Borel et al. *Algebraic D-Modules*. Perspectives in Mathematics, Vol. 2 J. Coates and S. Helgason editors.

- [DB.1] Du Bois Ph. Complexe de de Rham filtré d'une variété singulière. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **109** (1981), 41–81.
- [DB.2] Du Bois Ph. Dualité dans la catégorie des complexes filtrés d'opérateurs différentiels d'ordre ≤ 1 . *Collect. Math.*, **41** (1990), 89–121.
- [EGA] Grothendieck A. and Dieudonné J. Eléments de géométrie algébrique. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, **4** (1960), **8** (1961), **11** (1961), **17** (1963), **20** (1964), **24** (1965), **28** (1966), **32** (1967).
- [HL] Herrera M. and Lieberman D. Duality and the de Rham cohomology of infinitesimal neighborhoods. *Invent. Math.*, **13** (1971), 97–124.
- [M] Mebkhout Z. *Le formalisme des six opérations de Grothendieck pour les $\mathcal{D}_X$ -modules cohérents*. Travaux en Cours, 35, *Hermann, Paris*, 1989.
- [S.1] Saito M. Modules de Hodge polarisables. *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.*, **24** (1988), 849–995.
- [S.2] Saito M. Induced $\mathcal{D}$ -modules and differential complexes. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **117** (1989), 361–387.

Luisa Fiorot
 Università degli Studi di Padova
 Dipartimento di Matematica Pura e Appl.
 via Belzoni 7
 35131 Padova
 Italy
 fiorot@math.unipd.it

Université Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg
 UFR de Mathématique
 7 rue René Descartes
 67084 Strasbourg
 France
 fiorot@math.u-strasbg.fr